

Release  
Date: January 22, 1998  
Release #: S.C. 02/98

## **SUMMARY OF CASES ACCEPTED DURING THE WEEK OF JANUARY 12, 1998**

[This news release is issued to inform the bar and the public of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The description or descriptions set out below do not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#98-1 People v. Barella, S065511. (A075711; 57 Cal.App.4th 1369.)  
Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case concerns whether the restriction on the earning of credits imposed by the three strikes law is a direct consequence of the plea of which a guilty pleading defendant must be informed. (Pen. Code, §§ 667(c)(5); 1170.12(a)(5).)

#98-2 People v. Cortina, S065488. (E016568.) Unpublished opinion.  
Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

#98-3 People v. Griffin, S065531. (E016735.) Unpublished opinion.  
Petitions for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part judgments of conviction of criminal offenses.

Cortina and Griffin both include an issue, concerning the relationship between Penal Code sections 654 and 667(c)(6), similar to one before the court in People v. Deloza, S061929. (See #97-119.)

(over)

#98-4 Lambert v. City & County of San Francisco S065446. (A076116; 57 Cal.App.4th 1172.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a summary judgment in a civil action. This case concerns whether the same heightened scrutiny is utilized in an inverse condemnation action following denial of a permit because the applicant failed to pay a discretionary fee as is utilized in an action following the granting of a permit conditioned on the payment of a monetary extraction.

#98-5 Mueller v. Saint Joseph Medical Center, S065893. (B108322; 58 Cal.App.4th 1531.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order dismissing a civil action. This case concerns the effects of the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act on actions against health care professionals under the Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act. (See Welf. & Inst. Code, § 15657.2.)

#